

after Walker was removed to Springfield, a U.S. district judge, Claude Clayton, issued an order for Walker to be given a psychiatric examination. Such an examination, according to Judge Clayton, will take from 60 to 90 days.

The evident purpose of this maneuver was that of depriving Walker of an opportunity to raise bail as set in his preliminary hearing, pending his trial of the charges before an appropriate Federal court.

All of this, for many people, will take on the color of police state methods. Modern history is full of incidents in which either the Nazis or the Communists have spirited away a critic or a politician opposed to their regime. This kind of thing must not be allowed to happen in this country, regardless of how any of us may feel about this retired Army general. If he should be proved in Federal court guilty of the four serious counts against him or guilty of any of them, then none of us could make tenable objections to the law taking its course. He must not be given special treatment or special punishment, however, because he knocked heads with the Kennedy administration during his military career.

An additional part of this incident, which will cause wonderment, is the fact that Walker was, in effect, committed to a mental institution in the absence of any legal counsel on his part and with no examination to determine even tentatively his mental condition. As almost everyone knows, before commitment to a mental institution in most of the States—all, so far as we know—there must be an examination by competent medical authorities.

Referring again to the statement made at the outset of this piece, what we are mainly concerned with is maintaining a government of laws and again rejecting a government of men. Our whole body of law avers that no man shall be held a political prisoner and if action by officials, be they Federal judges or not, takes on the color of political imprisonment then that is repugnant to the whole Nation. In preserving Walker's rights in this matter, the freedom of every one of us is directly concerned.

We hold no brief even for Walker's being in Mississippi during the battle of Oxford. He would have done much better, in our judgment, to have stayed at home where he belonged. Nevertheless, as an American citizen, he exercised the right to go to Mississippi, where his behavior, once it is established in a court of law, should determine whether or not he should be sent to jail or exonerated of the charge.

### BREAKING THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in spite of the remarkable advances made in the science of communications during this space age, man has been unable to eliminate the language barrier which continues to separate peoples of all nations and which hinders the free exchange of information and ideas. A step toward the solution of this problem was made recently with the formation of the International Committee for Breaking the Language Barrier. This group has members from 26 nations, and is under the sponsorship of the American Friends Service Committee and International House at Columbia University. It is dedicated to facilitating international travel and communication by promoting the adoption of universal pictorial signs at airports, in-

formation centers and public buildings. Eventually, the group hopes to work through the U.N. for the adoption of a universal language.

The committee will meet in New York next month to initiate a pilot project in that city. Because it is our largest port of entry for foreign visitors and new arrivals, New York is the most appropriate place to begin this campaign. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to commend this committee's work, and to welcome their efforts in my State.

### WYOMING PHOSPHATE PROSPECTING PERMITS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Members of Congress quickly learn that one of their most intricate jobs is trying to untangle the Federal redtape that so often entraps us all. My colleague, Senator Hickey, has demonstrated that he is a rapid learner in this art, to the benefit of our State and constituents.

An editorial pointing out Senator Hickey's contribution to progress appeared in the October 2 issue of the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATOR HICKEY WINS ANOTHER ROUND IN BATTLE FOR PHOSPHATE PERMITS

Another step on the painful path of cutting bureaucratic redtape has been taken in the efforts to secure prospecting permits for the phosphate deposit located southeast of Lander.

Carrying the biggest pair of shears in the cutting process has been Senator JOE HICKEY. Senator Hickey has done yeoman work pursuing this project and certainly deserves nothing but credit for his work in this regard for the economic growth of Wyoming.

Senator Hickey has found that even with the forces of the administration, the White House, and the heads of the Department of the Interior lined up in back of him—success with the U.S. Geological Survey has been anything but sensational.

Only a compromise at the last minute has made possible the promise from Assistant Interior Secretary John Carver that some prospecting permits will be issued and that other areas will be offered Susquehanna-Western under general lease.

So far this is only a promise. The U.S. Geological Survey hasn't said what it is going to do, or require, yet. In the meantime, the U.S. Geological Survey from its Salt Lake office has been carrying on a subtle campaign of subversion against the prospecting permit law passed by Congress.

The U.S. Geological Survey indicated to business columnist Bob Bernick in Salt Lake a couple of weeks ago that the prospecting permit system in the Phosphate Act had been a failure because "only a few permits had been issued."

Somebody ought to ask either Susquehanna or Senator Hickey how difficult the U.S. Geological Survey makes it to get a permit and the perversity of the U.S. Geological Survey position would readily be seen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

### CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the President of Cuba, like a two-bit Khrushchev, has disgraced the name of Cuba in the United Nations. The similarity of his performance to the shoe-rattling act which we witnessed 2 years ago is obvious. If any evidence were ever needed that Castro's Cuba is a Soviet carbon copy, it has been presented before the world tribunal.

Cuba represents a new and menacing shift in the world balance of power. As Congress moves toward adjournment, I trust that all of us, regardless of party, are united in the hope that this Nation, through its chosen leaders and in cooperation with its allies, will progress resolutely toward the stern decisions which may be necessary to deal with the Soviet cloud now darkening our national horizon.

No course of action can be entirely without risks. The President needs the support of us all if he is to find and follow the path of strength and wisdom.

At the recently concluded meeting of Foreign Ministers of member nations of the Organization of American States, President Kennedy made a forthright and urgent appeal for concerted action to contain and isolate the Cuban cancer. I commend the President's direct approach. "Communism," he said, "can be the death of this hemisphere," and we know in our hearts that he spoke truly.

This, of course, does not hide the fact that the danger should have been pinpointed earlier. When the military buildup began, our Government should have stated publicly that the presence of Soviet troops and technicians in Cuba was viewed by the United States as a hostile act and we should have registered a formal complaint with the Soviet Union.

The Foreign Ministers of the American nations, at their informal meeting last week, uttered what should have been said months ago at the Punta del Este Conference, that Soviet intervention in Cuba poses a threat to the hemisphere. To achieve even this acknowledgment of reality taxed to the utmost the considerable abilities of Secretary of State Rusk.

The OAS Ministers geared their final communique to a common denominator based on the softest view. As one trained observer put it:

To at least three nations of this hemisphere—Mexico, Chile and Brazil—the actuality of Soviet intervention in Cuba sometimes seems of less concern than the possibility of U.S. intervention.

The United States had hoped to achieve a recommendation for an embargo on all hemisphere trade with Cuba. It came away having committed itself to certain unilateral actions on shipping. These are forceful and commendable. It is entirely possible also that they may set an example for joint hemisphere action and exercise some persuasion on our NATO allies.

By paving the way for these possibilities, and by labeling Castro communism for the threat it is, this in-

formal meeting of the OAS has served a useful purpose.

It is gratifying that the United States is acting to make trade with Cuba more costly and risky, not only for those shippers who trade directly, but for those who operate through chartered vessels. To launch the OAS gathering, the United States announced two steps:

Our ports no longer will be available for use by ships carrying arms and strategic goods to Communist Cuba. It is true that Cuba's arms supplies have been delivered exclusively in Soviet bottoms, which do not use U.S. ports anyway, but the new provision will ban any other Soviet bloc vessels which may deliver war goods to the island. This point, however, is largely psychological and of no practical significance.

In the case of strategic goods, non-Communist vessels, if they carry goods to Cuba, will be barred from picking up profitable return cargoes at U.S. ports. Furthermore, our foreign aid shipments will not be permitted to move out in vessels which have supplied Castro.

I have urged these steps for some time. On September 24, I urged the President to direct the Departments of State and Agriculture to clamp down immediately on shipment of U.S. foreign aid in vessels supplying Soviet goods to Cuba. These two Departments had been looking the other way while ships sold themselves first to the Soviets, then to the United States, making a fat profit by working both sides of the street.

Until the new ban goes into effect, which I understand will be in a week or two, the American taxpayer is partially subsidizing the Cuban buildup by offering profitable return cargoes to vessels unloading at Cuban ports. This situation will prevail until the Executive order goes into effect.

Mr. President, over the weekend I made six appearances in my State. When people were told that ships had been bringing strategic goods to Cuba and then moving to a U.S. port and loading up with foreign aid shipments and making a profitable journey back, they would hardly believe that such commerce has been going on. It has been going on. It is a condition to which I called attention some time ago, and it has now been conceded.

In achieving this limited ban, we owe a debt to private enterprise for exercising strong initiative.

As many of us are aware, U.S. ship-owners and union leaders have been far ahead of the Government in urging a tightening up of shipping to and from Cuba. I commend the action of the union which announced that its members would not load ships with goods going to Cuba.

Further, we will cancel contracts with shipping companies carrying our foreign aid commodities abroad if they permit their vessels to engage in Cuban trade. All of these steps are highly desirable and, in my judgment, overdue.

The United States, however, must take a strong and continuing initiative to contain the noxious weed now rooted in Cuba and rapidly spreading through the

hemisphere through Castro trainees and Castro's hate broadcasts.

The time for informal talks is past. The time for leisurely meetings is past. The Council of the Organization of American States has scheduled a meeting for this afternoon. However, the Council cannot take major action. This must be done by the hemisphere Foreign Ministers.

I hope, therefore, that today's meeting will be followed promptly by a formal meeting of the OAS. Now is the time for the United States to keep up the momentum as we work to develop binding hemisphere actions.

Immediately after the formal OAS meeting, I suggest that the administration announce a reasonable deadline for a hemisphere program of action based on such affirmative suggestions as are produced.

Member nations of the OAS should be fully informed that failure to act in concert will be the signal for unilateral moves by the United States. They should, of course, be apprised in detail of what those actions will be. In other words, if OAS proves apathetic, we must spell out the precise course we intend to pursue on our own.

It is vital also that we spell out for the Soviet Union the actions to be taken—either by OAS or by the United States—giving them advance notice of the limitations we set upon infiltration, subversion, and military activity in the Western Hemisphere.

This will be far from easy. It will require that we, by taking firm and direct positions, completely reverse what seems to be a basic Soviet premise. Russian diplomats are quoted as saying in recent press dispatches, "The American people will not fight over Cuba, over Berlin, over Laos, or over almost anything else."

If this is Khrushchev's premise—and our behavior thus far may have given him such an impression—then he is assuming the United States will continue to retreat in the world's trouble spots and throughout Latin America.

Let us set one point straight before this Congress adjourns. Because we are in a political campaign, the temptation apparently has been irresistible for some to read politics into the Cuban discussions. This is a slick, easy way to write off criticism.

In the case of Cuba, the dagger is pointing at us all. Under our form of government, it is as much the duty of citizens and public officials to criticize foreign policy as any other area of public affairs.

Suggestions and critical comment on Cuba have come from all quarters, some from members of the President's own party, and surely these were not politically motivated. By and large, as attested by editorial opinion throughout the country, the criticism has been constructive. None of it can be said to have given aid and comfort to the aggressors, who bracket both Republicans and Democrats into their total hatred for the United States.

Those who would criticize us for speaking out are sowing confusion. Indeed,

how can any Member of Congress fail to speak out, when we are bombarded daily with evidence of the deep concern of our people? It floods into our offices in mailbags, it dominates our television screens, and fills the news columns of our daily papers.

Several typical examples came to my attention recently. These did not originate in Florida, which is separated from Cuba by a narrow strip of water, where people understandably are worried and vociferous about the Communist buildup. They came from California, almost 4,000 miles from the new Soviet island satellite, and were reported by the respected columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop.

It is dangerous to exaggerate, but it is impossible not to be deeply impressed—

He wrote—

when you hear a solid, hard-working family man pointing to his neat little house and saying, "The policy I favor might mean an A-bomb right there. But I'll risk that. It's worth it to win."

Surely every Member of Congress prays to God, as I do, that this will not be the cost of a firm policy. I happen to think that it is more likely to be the cost of a weak, indecisive policy or the cost of no policy at all. And the history books support my belief as they trace the pattern of aggression by 20th century dictators. The evidence is compounded in the tragic fate of the victims who waited too long to meet the threat—keeping the peace, as the threat grew stronger and more ominous, until in the end the tyrant steamrollered across another innocent nation which loved peace, not wisely but too well.

The lesson of this story has been spelled out in one of the most profound statements of English literature:

Cowards die many times before their deaths. The valiant never taste of death but once.

And so an obscure California householder, miles away from Washington, obviously is miles ahead of Washington in facing up to the meaning of Cuba. The American people, if not their leaders, have learned the lesson of Munich. They know the difference between "peace" and "peace with freedom." They make no attempt to kid themselves by minimizing the Cuban threat or sweeping it under the rug. They look with quiet courage into the eyes of the dictator.

Let us hope Khrushchev is aware of these quiet Americans. Let us hope he takes into account their strength and determination as he plots his aggressive ventures.

Late in August I called attention to the Russian arsenal in Cuba. At that time I set forth four proposals for handling the situation. I believed then that they were constructive. I believe now that their soundness has been underscored. I am gratified that the administration now has acted at least upon some of them. In my view they remain a sensible and sound approach for the United States.

My first suggestion, made August 31, called upon the administration to tell the American people all of the facts

about the island buildup. Reliable information had reached me concerning the number of ships, types of armament, and Soviet troops arriving in Cuba. There was no doubt in my mind that I was certainly not alone in possessing the information. I could see no threat to our national security by giving the American people facts already possessed by Cubans and Russians. Indeed, it obviously would jeopardize our ability to cope with the ever-growing threat if we lulled Americans into a false sense of security.

On August 29, just 2 days earlier, the President told a reporter that he had no information that Russians were sending Nike-type missiles to Cuba, after the reporter cited a State Department source to that effect. Following my revelations on the Senate floor, on August 31, the administration first declared, through a Senator on the other side of the aisle, that Senator KEATING was "misinformed." Nevertheless, there followed from other quarters an effort to make it appear that the information I had reported had been released earlier by the State Department.

On September 4, however, the President conceded that Nike-type missiles had been delivered to Castro and confirmed in almost every detail the facts I had stated 4 days earlier. The President characterized the buildup as "defensive." This, in my view, was a tremendous error and a serious concession to the Soviets. That was their line. It should not be ours.

Since then I have suggested that the American people would welcome weekly reports from the White House on the extent of the buildup. These have not been forthcoming, although two State Department estimates have been made public. Both emphasize the continuing nature of the Soviet buildup and the increasing danger of the situation. Under Secretary of State Ball now admits that 85 ships have delivered troops and war goods to the island.

He admits that 15 missile sites have been established, and it is estimated that the total will eventually reach 25. This knowledge has been possessed for a long time by many of us. Under Secretary Ball said that the slant range of these antiaircraft missiles is 20 to 25 miles, not 15 miles. He said that four missile sites of different types have been identified. He said that these sites are similar to known Soviet defense missile sites which are believed to contain antishipping missiles having a range of 20 to 25 miles. The significant sentence, rather buried away, is that several more such sites will be installed.

Many other facts have been stated which have been known to some of us, but which have not been publicly stated before. The statement was made that 4,500 troops are stationed in Cuba. It will be remembered that the first figure given was 3,000. I stated that there were at least 5,000. The first figure given by the President was 3,000. That was advanced to 4,200. It has now been advanced to 4,500. I stand on my statement that more than 5,000 troops are stationed in Cuba. Five thousand is a modest figure. But I commend the

Under Secretary of State for revealing these additional facts.

My second recommendation called for the convening of the Organization of American States to develop a prompt hemisphere course of action. This, as we have seen, was taken up by administration officials and 2 days of informal discussions have been held. As indicated earlier, this has served a constructive purpose by producing an acknowledgment of the threat and perhaps laying a basis for something more than talk. It is obvious that it will be up to the United States to forge the OAS into an instrument for action, and no time should be lost in doing so.

My third proposal concerned our NATO allies. I urged that they recognize that Cuba is an advanced Communist base, and that the strictest limitations be imposed on shipments of strategic and economic items to Cuba. It will be necessary, of course, for the United States to exercise strong persuasion to achieve this.

Today, according to press reports, roughly half of the cargoes going into the island from the Communist bloc move in the ships of six of our allies. They are Britain, Canada, Greece, Italy, Norway, and West Germany.

For example, the U.S. Maritime Administration reports that in June, July, and August, merchant vessels flying the flags of 20 non-Communist nations made 185 trips to Cuba. Over 60 percent of this traffic moved in the ships of NATO members Greece, Britain, West Germany, and Norway. To a lesser extent Denmark, Italy, and Turkey participated in this trade.

The administration followed up my third proposal with limited success.

In an attempt to learn which allied nations are cooperating, my office called the Department of State. According to their expert, six nations have either stopped or will stop chartering ships for the Cuba trade. They are, the State Department says, Turkey, West Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, and Canada.

In checking the Canadian Embassy, however, we were surprised to learn that the State Department was inaccurate. The Canadians say they have not banned charter of their ships by the Soviets. Furthermore, an Associated Press dispatch from Ottawa dated October 4 indicates that the Canadian Government has no intention of doing so.

If such disagreement exists between information available from the State Department and the Embassy of the nation involved, it casts some reflection on the accuracy of the balance of the information given by the State Department to my office. In fact, State Department, Embassy, and press reports concerning nations which have taken actions, either governmental or private, concerning use of their ships in the Soviet trade with Cuba, seem to be in conflict.

Therefore, I urge that the State Department publish as soon as possible, an up-to-date tabulation of nations whose ships are being chartered by the Soviets, showing what action, if any, each one has taken to clamp down on the Cuba trade.

According to the Department of State, the Greek Government reports a lack of

authority to interfere with shipment of nonstrategic materials, although they have appealed to their shipowners not to supply shipping for Cuba.

The Norwegian Government, again according to the State Department, has requested its shipowners not to carry military goods to Cuba, but no overall ban has been put into effect. So far as I know, Norway has never carried any military goods as such to Europe.

The situation with Great Britain apparently is under negotiation, with no substantial progress reported.

I repeat, the urgency of this matter is such that the State Department should keep the American people informed by publishing an accurate tabulation, and keeping it up to date.

To those nations which brush us off with the comment that Cuba is a U.S. problem, we must drive home the point of my opening remarks, that Cuba represents a new and menacing shift in the world balance of power. It is an ominous development in the global war which involves all men of good will, which threatens Western Europe, Britain, and other free nations.

Therefore, it is impossible for us to accept specious reasoning or shallow excuses. Every non-Communist ship going into Cuba is releasing a Soviet ship for spreading the poison elsewhere, and is thus contributing directly to the Soviet takeover of Cuba and further Soviet penetration of the free world.

This is so vital a concept that some concerned observers have suggested that we blacklist all foreign ships, allied or otherwise, and ban them from every American port if they continue this pro-Soviet activity.

We are still in the process of implementing the first three of these proposals which I outlined on September 4 and thus have not reached the point of considering the fourth, which was, failing concerted action by the OAS, the United States should give serious consideration to serving notice that we will intercept all vessels in Western Hemisphere waters which we have reason to suspect carry armed forces personnel or materiel.

I vigorously take issue with anyone who terms this proposal irresponsible. The Navy Department, which holds primary responsibility for such a blockade, has more than once endorsed bottling up Cuba in this fashion. It urged such action long ago. If it had been taken then, the risk would have been minimal. Admittedly it involves greater risks now than it did 6 months ago, when it was urged. But the risks will be infinitely greater 6 months from now.

A blockade, of course, should be considered only after other means have been exhausted. It should be put into effect not suddenly but, rather, after full and sufficient notice has been given, providing ample opportunity for the opposition to back away.

In the meantime, I fully agree that the United States should support and encourage the Cuban guerrilla fighters now harassing the Soviets on the island. Without outside help, they have no chance of victory.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it is rather ironic that some of those who denounced as warmongering, suggestions for a possible blockade, now call strongly for support of the guerrillas, although under no interpretation can that be viewed as a peaceful solution, and it presents much more risk of involvement than would a pacific or limited blockade.

In my opinion, the United States also should launch a massive propaganda campaign to counter Castro's subversive broadcasts throughout Latin America. Surely the USIA can place the transmitters and the Spanish-speaking staff in operation at appropriate southern points. I can think of no project of higher priority at this particular time. If necessary, some USIA programs of lesser priority should be curtailed in order to concentrate intensely right now on the Cuban crisis.

One would not expect it to be necessary to suggest this type of propaganda counteroffensive to our experts. Unfortunately, however, according to my information, our current policy takes the reverse position.

A tiny 1-kilowatt Armed Forces radio station is operating on 1340 kilocycles, and is broadcasting approximately 17 hours a day from our Guantanamo Base. It has a daytime transmitting coverage of 35 to 38 miles, and less at night. About 1½ hours each day are in the Spanish language, reaching roughly 15,000 to 18,000 Cubans, of the total Cuban population of about 6½ million. Their Spanish-language broadcasts are made up principally of news, Cuban recordings, and Spanish-speaking entertainment.

Certainly this is far from a powerful propaganda outlet; but, according to my information, those in charge have been instructed to devote none of their broadcasting time to anything which might be construed as anti-Castro material. In addition, I am informed that the base commander sought permission to increase the volume of the station, in order to reach a larger number of Cubans; but this was denied by the Defense Department, undoubtedly after a policy discussion with the State Department.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I point out that it would be foolish to rule out the possibility that the United States may find itself virtually a "loner" in the path of communism's ruthless penetration of this Hemisphere.

If this should come about, there is no question in my mind that we shall behave like the great Nation we are. The American people expect no less. Our neighbor nations of the Americas—behind all the if's, and's and but's—look to us for leadership. The tongues of Communist flame are licking at the edges of the free world. The longer we wait to stamp them out, the more dangerous and costly it will be to freemen everywhere.

If the President acts firmly, decisively, and promptly, we shall be with him to a man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a statement issued by the Maritime Administration, of the Commerce Department, with re-

gard to the free world ships in the Cuban trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### I. INTRODUCTION

In view of the current concern of the Government of the United States over the shipments of arms and other cargoes to Cuba in Soviet-bloc and free world merchant ships, this study was undertaken to determine the patterns of free world shipping in the Cuban trade, the numbers and flags of registry of the free world ships engaged in such trade, and the companies involved. The study covers the 8-month period January 1 through August 31, 1962, and includes all free world merchant ships that have arrived in Cuba from countries other than Cuba during this period. The totals of ships and the number of trips by such ships to Cuba are believed to be conservative. Insofar as ownership of individual ships is concerned, the information presented has been obtained from reliable sources and is believed to be correct. However, this administration cannot vouch for its accuracy in every instance.

#### II. FREE WORLD SHIPS IN THE CUBAN TRADE

During the period January 1 through August 31, 1962, a total of 432 merchant ships (including 43 tankers) flying the flags of 22 free world countries made a total of 571 trips to Cuba. Ships flying the flags of Greece, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Norway accounted for 61 percent of the total ships involved and 60 percent of the total trips to Cuba. No U.S.-flag ships called at Cuban ports (other than the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay) during the period under study. The number of free world ships in the Cuban trade and the number of trips by such ships to Cuba during the period were more than double comparable figures for Soviet-bloc shipping. The following listing shows the ranking of the various free world countries whose ships engaged in trade with Cuba during the period January 1-August 31, 1962, arranged in order of the number of ships involved and the number of trips:

Flag	Number			
	Ships		Trips	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Greece.....	97	22	125	22
2. United Kingdom.....	77	18	109	19
3. Germany (Federal Republic).....	46	11	60	9
4. Norway.....	42	10	55	10
5. Lebanon.....	25	—	29	—
6. Italy.....	19	—	22	—
7. Japan.....	19	—	20	—
8. Denmark.....	17	—	33	—
9. Liberia.....	16	—	18	—
10. Sweden.....	15	—	19	—
11. Yugoslavia.....	14	—	20	—
12. Netherlands.....	12	—	14	—
13. Spain.....	9	—	30	—
14. Panama.....	8	—	8	—
15. France.....	5	—	5	—
16. Belgium.....	3	—	3	—
17. Finland.....	3	—	3	—
18. Chile.....	1	—	3	—
19. Morocco.....	1	—	2	—
20. Honduras.....	1	—	1	—
21. Switzerland.....	1	—	1	—
22. Turkey.....	1	—	1	—
Total.....	432	—	571	—

A number of ships in the Cuban trade also trade with Communist China, and a number of them are known to have carried title I, Public Law 480 cargoes.

The annex to this study provides details on the various free world ships in the Cuban

trade during the period January 1-August 31, 1962. It gives the names of the ships, the flags of registry, the dates of arrivals in Cuba, and, as appropriate, the shipowners, agents, and associated companies.

#### III. FREE WORLD SHIPPING COMPANIES IN THE CUBAN TRADE

The great majority of the shipowners (or agents) involved in the Cuban trade operated only a few ships into Cuba during the period under study. By far the most important group of shipping companies in the Cuban trade during the first 8 months of 1962 was the group consisting of the associated companies of London & Overseas Freighters, Ltd.; Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd.; and Counties Ship Management Co., Ltd. This group accounted for 28 ships that made a total of 65 trips, or more than 10 percent of the total trips made by free world ships to Cuba. Of the 43 tankers in the Cuban trade, 16 were associated with this group of shipping companies.

The annex to this study relates, as appropriate, the free world ships in the Cuban trade with the shipowners, agents, and associated companies.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions that may be drawn with respect to the free world ships and shipping companies engaged in trade with Cuba during the period January 1-August 31, 1962, are as follows:

(1) American ships and shipping companies are not engaged in trade with Cuba to any appreciable extent.

(2) The traditional European maritime nations are providing the bulk of the free world shipping for trade with Cuba.

(3) Free world ships greatly exceed in number Soviet-bloc ships trading with Cuba.

(4) Since the world's merchant fleet numbered 17,426 ships as of January 1, 1962, and since free world ships engaged in trade with Cuba constitute only 2½ percent of this total, it is doubtful that the Cuban trade is of any great significance in solving world shipping problems.

#### DELIVERY OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL PROPAGANDA MAIL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the bill on postal service and Federal employees salaries (H.R. 7929) contained a large number and a wide variety of provisions. There were many who believed that some of the provisions had much better been left out of the bill, to be considered separately and on their own merits. It is fair to say that had this been done, some of them would have been rejected. But since the bill was considered in its entirety, some undesirable portions of it were approved, together with some provisions which were meritorious in their own right. Such a conglomeration always makes difficult the decision as to one's vote on the question of final passage, and in this instance that certainly was the case.

However, one section of the bill is especially noteworthy as containing substance which would have been approved had it been considered either alone or in company with any other proposed legislation. It is section 306, which has for its subject the delivery of Communist political propaganda mail.

While its approval was the final product of many persons, this Senator notes with gratification the leading role played by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, in formulating the idea of dealing with this deadly menace of